

to prison for his presumption."—Ed. 1826, vol. viii., p. 49.

After this it is comparatively tame to learn from Sir Edward Walker that

"Notice was given of the action in Ireland, and the commitment of the Earl of Glamorgan, whose faults were rendered so odious as that it were a crime to do any good for the family."—*Historical Discourses*, p. 151.

The coincidence of character between the Earl's escapades in the matter of the Treaty and in that of the Patent seems, to say the least of it, remarkably suggestive. J. H. ROUND.

ROBIN HOOD.

98 Roebuck Road, Sheffield: Nov. 24, 1883.

My letter on the name of Robin Hood ACADEMY, September 15) has elicited two valuable communications—one from Miss Peacock (October 6) and the other from the Rev. Isaac Taylor (October 13)—which have deservedly attracted considerable notice. Mr. Taylor has been successful in showing that the story of Hood contains a larger element of nature-myth, and a smaller element of history and original invention, than I had myself supposed. It must further be admitted that a considerable portion of this story is ultimately derived from the great Aryan sun-myth. There is, however, the strongest reason for believing that the Anglian Hód (the Hódeken of Germany) was not originally a solar personage, but a degraded form of the God of the Wind, Hermes-Woden. The thievish character of this divinity (so clearly shown in the Homeric hymn to Hermes) explains at once why his name should have been chosen as the popular appellation of an outlaw chief. It should not be forgotten that in Scandinavian poetry Odin appears under the name of Hóttir (hat), which, in meaning, though not in etymology, is precisely identical with Hood.

When, however, Hood had come to be regarded as a merely human personage, and genuine historical incidents had been blended in his story, his career, like that of Charlemagne or Tell, naturally became a theme for romantic fiction. As invention always tends to run in accustomed channels, the story of Hood, like those of the other heroes just mentioned, was enriched with incidents which belonged originally to the Aryan solar myth.

Although no etymological connexion can be admitted between Hód and Hóðr (originally *Hæðu*), it is very probable that the similarity of the two names may, as Mr. Taylor supposes, have given rise to the incident of the death of Little John. It need not be denied that Little John may have been the actual designation of some historical outlaw; but the "great-little" man is a personage not unknown to students of mythology.

In support of Mr. Taylor's identification of Maid Marian with "the Dawn-maiden," I would suggest (without laying any great stress on the point) that the word *Morgen* (in *Lazamon mærcen*) might easily have been replaced by the current female name of similar sound.

It is perfectly obvious that the story of William of Cloudelee is a mere variant of that of Robin Hood. I cannot, however, follow Mr. Taylor in believing that the surname of the former hero indicates that he belongs to the family of the Nibelungs. When the name Cloudelee was formed the English people had long passed the stage in which any connexion is felt to exist between the incidents of mythology and the phenomena of nature. Moreover, Cloudelee may very well have been a genuine local name, whether we read it as *clúdes-hleó* (lee of the rock) or compare it with *Bæda's* *Coludsburh*. I am not, however, aware that any place named Cloudelee really exists.

HENRY BRADLEY.

COMPARATIVE MYTHOLOGY.

Barton-on-Humber: Dec. 3, 1883.

It is refreshing to turn from the misrepresentations of the *Saturday Review* critic who recently attacked my *Myth of Kírké* to the cautious language of Mr. A. Lang in the ACADEMY of December 1. My critic, after saying, "Mr. Brown's arguments are something like this"—just as a caricature is something like the original—thus distorts my view: "Odysseus lived in a cave, therefore Odysseus is the sun;" and then makes a reference to Robinson Crusoe in order "to set on some quantity of barren spectators to laugh." I can only rejoice that I never said anything of the kind. Again, what knowledge the critic has of Euphratean matters I don't know, inasmuch as he has kept it all to himself, but the circumstance certainly makes his verdict less important. Thus my comparison between Kírké and Istar, which Prof. Sayce, who may be allowed to speak with some authority, finds "self-convincing," is to this critic imaginary; and he assures me that I shall find "as close coincidences in the legends of Madagascar, Mangaia," and, I suppose, any other place beginning with M. But even when we turn from him to Mr. Lang's objection to the method of Sir George Cox, the same unfortunate misrepresentation of the matter occurs. Mr. Lang says, "That method rests on the philological interpretation of the names," and is "the exclusively philological method." But Sir George says, "Assuredly neither Odysseus, Herakles, nor any other can be the sun, unless their names, their general character, and their special features carry us to this conclusion." No one supposes Kírké to represent the moon merely because her name means "the round." It is here, again, that my *Saturday* critic makes such a palpable error—i.e., he treats the evidence as if it were a chain, the strength of which is its weakest link; whereas it forms a portrait, the effect of which depends on the entirety.

No mythologist objects to the study of the ideas of savages; but what many students feel very strongly with regard to Mr. Lang's opinions, so far as they can be made out, is that they never supply any real explanation, just as my *Saturday* critic explains (?) the character of Kírké by the dictum "souvent femme varie." Similarly, from a paper by "A. L." in the *Cornhill*, called "How the Stars got their Names," we can only gather that it was because *divers people gave them those names*; and we are informed that the Greeks received "the myths and the names of the constellations" from savages, whereas, as most people are now aware, they got the *Ram* and his fellows from the civilisation of Babylonia. Let any student compare this making capital of nescience with my theory of the matter as set forth in *Eridanus, River and Constellation*, and judge for himself.

Mr. Lang is fond of beast-myths. May I venture to ask him to read my account of the myth of the lion and the leopard in *The Unicorn*, and he will see how little the explanation depends upon philology, and how the natural phenomena theory alone supplies the key?

But, lastly, a word on philology. Does Mr. Lang really pretend that, because there is disagreement on some minor points and on certain difficult names, therefore philology is a worthless assistant? The contention, if valid, would equally have proved the worthlessness of astronomy. Now, in astrology there was, and is, a wonderful consensus of opinion; and hence, I presume, it has always been the sounder science of the two. Does Mr. Lang also deny that there are numbers of mythological epithets—e.g., Mars and the Maruts—the etymology of which has been agreed on by all scholars worthy of the name, and has supplied a most convincing illustration of the concept of the particular per-

sonage? It may be that Kuhn and Bréal and a score of other great workers in this field are wholly mistaken; but the evidence in proof has not yet been revealed either by Mr. Lang or by the critic of the *Saturday Review*.

ROBT. BROWN, JUNR.

APPOINTMENTS FOR NEXT WEEK.

- MONDAY, Dec. 10, 5 p.m. London Institution: "The Indian Ryot," by Sir William Wedderburn.
8 p.m. Society of Arts: Cantor Lecture, "The Scientific Basis of Cookery," II., by Mr. W. Mattieu Williams.
8 p.m. Aristotelian: "Berkeley's Principles of Human Knowledge" (concluded), by Mr. A. M. Ogilvie.
8.30 p.m. Geographical: "A Visit to Kafiristan," by Mr. W. W. McNair.
TUESDAY, Dec. 11, 8 p.m. Royal Academy: "Chemistry of the Methods of Painting," by Prof. A. H. Church.
8 p.m. Colonial Institute: "Our Relations with Canada and Great Colonies," by the Marquis of Lorne.
8 p.m. Anthropological Institute: "Some Australian Ceremonies of Initiation," by Mr. A. W. Howitt; "The Use of the Terms *Celt* and *German*," by Dr. R. G. Latham.
8 p.m. Civil Engineers: "The Preparation and Use of Rheca Fibre," by Dr. J. Forbes Watson.
8 p.m. Microscopical: "Sections of Diatoms," by Dr. J. H. T. Flügel.
THURSDAY, Dec. 13, 7 p.m. London Institution: "The Glaciers of the Alps," by Prof. G. W. Henslow.
8 p.m. Royal Academy: "Testing of Pigments: Examination of Old Paints and Old Pictures," by Prof. A. H. Church.
8 p.m. Mathematical: "The Form of Standing Waves on the Surface of Running Water," by Lord Rayleigh; "A Method of Finding the Plane Sections of a Surface, and Some Considerations as to its Extension to Space of more than Three Dimensions," by Mr. W. J. C. Sharp.
8 p.m. Telegraph Engineers: Annual General Meeting; "An Instrument for Measuring the Strength of a Magnetic Field" and "A Method of Calculating the Total Horse-power expended in a Network of Conductors," by Mr. J. E. H. Gordon.
FRIDAY, Dec. 14, 8 p.m. New Shakspeare: "The Introduction to my New Edition of *Shakspeare*," by Mr. R. G. White.
8 p.m. Quckett.
8 p.m. Folk-Lore: "The Philosophy of Punctuation," by Mr. E. Clodd; "An Additional Chapter in Folk Medicine," by Mr. W. G. Black.

SCIENCE.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ARYANS.

Origines Ariacae: Linguistisch-ethnologische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der arischer Völker und Sprachen. By K. Penka. (Vienna: Prochaska.)

Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte: Linguistisch-historische Beiträge zur Erforschung des indogermanischen Altertums. By O. Schrader. (Jena: Costenoble.)

THESE are both of them remarkable works, and of equal interest to the philologist, the ethnologist, and the student of culture. Though traversing different fields of research, the method followed by their authors is very similar, and many of the results they arrive at are much the same; but they differ greatly in the treatment of the subjects with which they deal. While the Viennese Professor is daring and comprehensive, the Professor of Jena is cautious and critical. The resemblance of their modes of procedure and general conclusions must be ascribed to the present position of science and the new ideas that have been suggested by recent discoveries.

During the last half-dozen years a silent revolution has been taking place in comparative philology. Little is known about it in England, for English scholars have but recently awakened to the value and meaning of the work done by Bopp and Schleicher and Curtius, and have not yet learned that this already belongs to a past stage in the history of linguistic science. The revolution, never-